

V10 100816

<cn>9

<ct>Teacher Education in England: Professional Preparation in Times of Change

<ca>*Jacek Brant and Katharine Vincent*

<h1>Introduction

This chapter explores what we understand by good teachers, good teaching and the elements necessary for appropriate teacher education in a time of change and uncertainty where the reform of teacher education is *en vogue* worldwide. This is particularly the case in England, which has seen a fundamental change in the landscape of schooling and the preparation of new teachers in the last forty years. The famous 1976 ‘Ruskin speech’ by the then British Prime Minister Callaghan can be seen as a turning point in educational policy in England; Callaghan criticized the way in which education had become a ‘secret garden’ in which the practices of teachers and other educational professionals had become shrouded in mystery. At that time in England, there was no National Curriculum, no parental choice as to which state schools their children would attend and no league tables of examination results. The Ruskin speech ignited a public debate that helped generate a political climate in which it was seen as acceptable for the government to take a proactive role in determining what should happen in schools. This included, in succeeding years, the introduction of a national curriculum, greater diversity in types of schools and what they offer, a reduction in the role of local authorities, new forms of examination and assessment, Ofsted¹ inspections and the publishing of examination league tables, as well as the introduction of a degree of parental choice in relation to school admissions.

The preparation of teachers was not exempt from radical overhaul during this time. Despite a political climate of distrust of schools and teachers, schools were increasingly given a larger role in teacher preparation, which had moved under the aegis of universities during the post-war period. The distrust of universities by successive Conservative governments since 1979 was evident and steps were taken to dilute their influence by giving schools more power and influence during the 1980s (Whitty et al. 1997). For example, in 1984, the government made university-school partnership mandatory, stipulated that teacher education programmes should be developed and run in close partnership with schools and, significantly, specified

the minimum number of days that pre-service teachers should spend in schools during the PGCE² programme (DES 1984). In 1989, the Licensed Teacher Scheme (LTS) was introduced; unqualified teachers could be employed by schools as ‘instructors’ and later gain Qualified Teacher Status (QTS)³ via on-the-job training, with the school being responsible for the training arrangements. In 1993, School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) introduced the idea of teacher training being delivered by consortiums of schools operating together and sharing their expertise. Yet despite the LTS and SCITT, the vast majority of initial teacher preparation remained within universities. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to offer a detailed explanation of the reasons for the changes to both schooling and teacher preparation in England, but given that legislation was not based on research evidence and there was little or no consultation of stakeholders, it is fair to conclude that the radical changes to the educational landscape were ideologically driven.

During this period of unprecedented reform in initial teacher education (ITE), Circular 9/92⁴ (DfE 1992) addressed three areas: the amount of time spent in schools, the relationship between university and school and *Competences* (later renamed Standards) that student teachers were required to display in order to be awarded QTS. Teacher education programmes leading to QTS stipulated a minimum of 120 days in schools during a one year-long course. For many universities, this required a major rethinking of course content, with less emphasis on learning theory and more on the necessity of preparing student teachers for ‘survival’ in the classroom. A significant element of Circular 9/92 was the requirement for student teachers (STs) to demonstrate a number of competences before being awarded QTS. The competences were far-reaching and prescriptive and, while it is beyond the scope of this chapter to debate in depth the merits of competency-based assessment, it is widely accepted that the stated competences represented a movement away from a focus on the idea of teacher education as a complex and holistic endeavour rooted in intellectual and academic concerns.

One way in which schools were encouraged to become more involved with teacher education was through the ‘Training Schools’ initiative which, when it was introduced in 2000, was seen as a way of encouraging schools to specialize in professional development and teacher preparation, in addition to their main *raison d’être* of teaching pupils. The Teaching Schools and Teaching School Alliances which exist today can be seen as a development of this, with a

similar focus on groups of schools working together to improve the quality of initial and ongoing teacher professional development.

<h1>The good teacher and good teaching

Teaching at its best is a highly skilled, dynamic and creative process that involves utilizing a whole range of different types of knowledge and acquired professional expertise. The demands made by society for our education system are not easy for teachers to fulfil: we expect our students to be knowledgeable and to demonstrate this by passing examinations; we expect our students to be equipped with ‘twenty-first century’ skills that go beyond traditional school-based learning; we expect our students to be motivated, enthusiastic and engaged in their school-based learning. Yet teaching is often undervalued and underestimated, perhaps because politicians, parents and other professionals do not understand the demands of the classroom, the complexity of the knowledge and skills on which teachers have to draw and the difficulty of developing the level of expertise required to be a successful teacher.

Ofsted, when discussing the quality of teaching, uses adjectives such as ‘competent’, ‘effective’ and ‘outstanding’ both to describe individual teachers and to refer to the quality of teaching in particular lessons, schools and groups of schools (Turner-Bissett 2001). But what do ‘competent’, ‘effective’ and ‘outstanding’ mean in relation to a good lesson? Does the lesson need to be relevant and worthwhile? Does the lesson have to be well paced and engaging for students? Does the lesson need to develop students’ subject knowledge and understanding? One would imagine that a good lesson would have all of these qualities, but even if we agree on this, a further question remains about how an observer evaluates the ‘effectiveness’ of a lesson? Should an observer focus on the teacher and what is taught or on the learner and what is learnt? Research evidence (e.g. discussed in Hattie and Yates 2013) suggests that there is a strong relationship between good teaching and good learning. That relationship, however, is complex and multifaceted and often underestimated by those seeking to make judgements about teaching and teachers.

The DfEE (2000) Hay McBer report into teacher effectiveness identifies three groups of factors that influence pupil progress: teaching skills, professional characteristics and classroom climate. However, while the report acknowledges that competent teachers know

their subject (DfEE 2000: 8), it makes little reference to the kinds of subject or other specialist knowledge that teachers may need. There is a growing literature that signals the crucial importance of domain specific knowledge in good teaching and learning (e.g. Young and Lambert 2014), not only in relation to teachers' knowledge of the particular academic subject they may be teaching but also their knowledge of classrooms, learning and learners. Ellis (2007) argues for the importance of taking teachers' subject knowledge seriously; he sees it as complex and dynamic and avers that, although subject knowledge is important and prerequisite, there is a special category of teacher knowledge that exists between subject knowledge and effective teaching. Ellis's arguments are a logical development of Shulman's (1986a,b, 1987), who discusses categories of knowledge that are important for good teaching; pedagogical content knowledge being of special interest the blending of sound subject knowledge together with an understanding of pedagogy. Although subject to critique (e.g. Sockett 1987 and McEwan and Bull 1991 cited in Ellis 2007 and by Shulman himself (Shulman and Shulman 2004), Shulman's concept of pedagogical content knowledge is now part of the educational vernacular.

If theory was 'a dirty word' in the 1990s (McIntyre 1993), educational research and theorizing has now experienced something of a renaissance, with Hattie's (2009) meta-study of educational research well received and influential with policymakers. In 2011 the Department for Education financed the Sutton Trust to establish the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) as a new charity to improve the educational attainment of the poorest pupils in English schools (EEF 2015). As part of the EEF's remit, Coe et al (2014) produced a report articulating 'what makes great teaching'; the report reviewed over two hundred pieces of research to identify the elements of teaching with the strongest evidence of improving attainment of pupils. The report specified six factors that contribute to learning gain. The two most significant factors were 'content knowledge', that is teachers with strong knowledge and understanding of their subject make a significant impact on students' learning and 'quality of instruction'. 'Instruction', an Americanism, includes effective questioning by teachers and their use of assessment for learning. Coe et al (2014) explain that the other four elements of effective teaching evidence a moderate gain in students' learning. They are: classroom climate, which includes the quality of interaction between teachers and students as well as teacher expectations; classroom management, which includes 'efficient' use of lesson time and managing behaviour with clear rules that are consistently enforced; teachers' beliefs, the reasons why they adopt particular practices and their theories about learning; and

Comment [A1]: AQ: Please note that in the text "the report reviewed ..." the numeral 200 has been spelt out as per house style, which stipulates that large, round figures above 100 should be spelt out.

professional behaviours which relate to professional development, supporting colleagues and communicating with parents.

One way to judge whether teaching is 'effective' is by measuring the impact of teaching on students' learning, but this is difficult to achieve, not least because the relationship between teaching and students' learning is complex and not fully explained by educational researchers. While attempts to delineate this relationship have been made, it is accepted that they are problematic, partly because all of them involve making judgements about teachers' performance by measuring students' educational outcomes.

What constitutes good teaching is, therefore, contestable and open to debate. This is important because the question of how 'good teaching' is conceptualized is bound to influence how one thinks teachers should be *educated* or *trained*. Moore (2004) describes three teacher discourses. One is the media conceptualization of the charismatic or Saviour teacher (p. 56) who wins over his or her pupils through inspirational teaching 'against the odds'. Such teachers are usually 'outsiders' who make teaching look easy and natural and by implication they do not need 'training' as their subject knowledge, high expectations and enthusiasm apparently suffice. Another discourse is that of the competent craftsperson (p. 75). Such a teacher can learn the 'craft of the classroom' from an experienced practitioner and his or her competence can be measured against predefined competences or standards. Moore's third stated discourse is that of the reflective practitioner (p. 100). Here the teacher is a 'professional' who engages in scholarship and who reflects on his or her own teaching as a way of ongoing self-improvement.

So we may ask: Is teaching a craft, a science or an art? If it is a craft, then it is something that can be learned 'on the job' from a master craftsperson – in this case an experienced teacher in school. If it is a science, then it should be studied methodically and meta-studies may uncover the best approaches so that teachers can learn from expert researchers and try to replicate what they have learned from empirical research in their own classrooms. If we think about teaching as an art, then we are likely to believe that, like a work of art, it can't be reduced to component parts or rationally explained in the way that science may demand. But art is not a free for all either; or rather, it doesn't need to be. There are rules and theories and boundaries, even though sometimes the best work strays beyond them. Good teaching, surely, has elements of craft, science and art.

<h1>Teaching as a professional activity

The difficulty of conceptualizing teaching as a bounded activity, and defining what we mean by ‘good teaching’ or a ‘good teacher’, means that it is always going to be difficult for teaching to be perceived as a professional activity with the role and status of other professions. There is also, of course, a difference between professionalism and professionalization, with the former relating mainly to regulation and standardization and the latter to increased autonomy and independence. Hodgson and Spours (2003) argue that, in twenty-first century Britain, the teaching profession is conflicted, contested and confused, partly as a result of the piecemeal, divisive (: 5) nature of education policy since 1988, which has imposed teacher *professionalism* through increased regulation, standardization and accountability without delivering increased *professionalization*. Professionalism requires teachers to abide by particular sets of rules and regulations; professionalization would involve them having a central role in determining what these rules and regulations should be and how they should be implemented. English schools are characterized by the preponderance of externally determined accountability measures, including league tables and Ofsted inspections, which teachers have few opportunities to influence.

Comment [A2]: AQ: Please clarify this.

In the early 2000s, increased regulation and control of the teaching profession was introduced through the Teacher Training Agency (later the Teacher Development Agency) and the General Teaching Council, which explicitly aimed to contribute to improving standards of teaching and the quality of learning, and to maintain and improve standards of professional conduct among teachers, in the interests of the public (GTC 2004). Teachers, however, did not have full control over these bodies, in contrast with the classical professions in which entry, training, knowledge and conduct are all controlled by members (Davies 2005). In addition, the language of the standards documents was paternalistic, setting out the professional characteristics that a teacher should be expected to maintain and reminding teachers of their professional responsibility to be engaged in effective, sustained and relevant professional development (TDA 2007: 3).

This period also saw the introduction of various new alternatives to traditional teacher preparation programmes, including ‘leadership development programmes’ such as Fast-Track

teaching, Teach First and Future Leaders, which introduced a particular model of elitism into teacher education, aiming to recruit and train teachers with the potential to rapidly progress to senior leadership roles (CfBT 2009). All of these programmes appeared to share the belief that it is possible to identify, at an early stage of their careers, those with the potential not only to teach but also to be a school leader, reflecting the meritocratic tendency central to the New Labour project⁵: the underlying assumption that some are inherently more professional than others. This was also reflected in changes to school structures, which left schools with differing levels of scrutiny and oversight in relation to key areas of practice. Those designated as academies were not only exempt from any requirement to adhere to the national curriculum but also exempt from the requirement to employ teachers only with QTS.

Hargreaves et al. (2007) argue that changes in the extent to which teachers are seen (and see themselves) as professionals reflect wider changes in the nature of public sector work during the early twenty-first century, with many other occupations experiencing ‘de-professionalization’ and loss of autonomy, partly owing to changes in the nature of work and the introduction of ‘new managerialist techniques’ (Hargreaves et al. 2007: 24). This leads to teachers being given responsibility for the implementation rather than formulation of new policies and strategies, in the process becoming technicians rather than professionals (Leaton Gray 2007: 194). In practical terms, this means that teachers more likely to be expected to ‘deliver’ a curriculum rather than design it, to implement an assessment policy rather than to develop it, to be judged by a set of exam results rather than determining the contents of the syllabus. As a result, many teachers feel de-skilled and lacking in autonomy, with low morale linked to changes in policy direction at national and local level which are significant, sudden and often self-contradictory.

<h1>Initial Teacher Education and the role of university

Widely publicized and acknowledged research suggests that teachers matter (OECD 2005) (and more recently that the quality of teaching matters, Sutton Trust, 2014). Connell (2009) reasons that this consensus might suggest that governments wanting to improve education would be pouring vast resources into teacher education (p. 214). She notes that this hasn’t happened but that in wealthy countries there has actually been an imposition of new regulations and certifications instead within a school culture of national testing and league

tables. Her explanation for this state of affairs is in terms of the growth of a market-orientated neo-liberalism that is profoundly suspicious of professionalism (p. 217).

Within the current English system, some teachers are required to obtain QTS while others are not; some are involved with curriculum design and others only with 'delivery'; some are responsible for designing assessment systems while others must simply implement them. While some attain a level of power and status that would have been unthinkable in a previous generation, others are reduced to functionaries on an education production line (Cole 2004: 153) whose main responsibility is to read from a script which someone else has prepared. Within this context, the question of how to design and put into practice programmes of initial teacher education which prepare student teachers for the classroom appropriately and effectively becomes ever more difficult to answer. Brindley (2013) argues that one reason that the future of teacher education in the UK is in a state of flux is because of problems around its core purpose. Although this core purpose appears clear (the development or production of 'good teachers'), the reality is problematic because there is no common or shared understanding about what this means. Teacher education is, therefore, placed in the unenviable position of deciding whether its future lies in compliance or critique – or compromise (Brindley 2013: 394).

Determining the answer to this question is imperative for those working in teacher education. If we want teachers to be involved with curriculum design, shaping the curriculum in response to the needs of their students and the context in which they are working, then they will need certain knowledge and skills. If, on the other hand, we want the main role of most teachers to be the delivery in a prescribed way of a predetermined curriculum, then the teacher education that they need will look very different. If we do not want, or need, teachers to interrogate and potentially shape research, government policy and the work of key educational establishments, then they may not need the kind of knowledge and skills which are taught within universities as part of teacher education courses. If, on the other hand, we do want them to be able to do this, we need to think carefully about how we help them acquire this knowledge and these skills and the importance of the role of universities within this process.

The question of whether or not teachers should, at the beginning of their careers, be encouraged and taught how to question and interrogate current practice in schools is central

to the debate about the impact of the School Direct programme. Introduced in 2012, School Direct represents a huge expansion of previous 'school-led' programmes such as the GTP⁶ and SCITTs, which involve initial teacher education being predominantly designed and led by a school rather than a university. Teaching School Alliances and academy chains have been encouraged, and financially incentivized, to introduce School Direct by a government which has claimed that the aim is to improve the quality of teacher education and also the quality and quantity of those coming into the profession. There are essentially two variants of School Direct; one is where student teachers pay tuition fees and are enrolled at a university for a PGCE but, significantly, have to apply directly to schools and are interviewed by them before being considered for a place on the course. Schools were initially asked only to bid for School Direct places if they believed they were going to have a vacancy in a particular subject area and therefore potentially a job for the student teacher after their training year, creating a link between school-based training and employment, though this is no longer a requirement. There is growing evidence, though it is largely anecdotal at present, that one way in which School Direct has changed the landscape is in the way in which student teachers perceive their relationship with the schools where they undertake teaching practice. Although many School Direct student teachers are fee-paying university students with the same rights and responsibilities as other students, it appears that for some there is a difference in the way they perceive their roles because of their relationship with the schools which have recruited them. It is not difficult to imagine that a student teacher might perceive differently a request made by a school to which they have been sent for teaching practice by their university tutor, and the same request made by a school which has recruited and interviewed them and suggested they might be offered a job at the end of the course. If a student teacher, for example, is given a timetable which requires them to teach more than the recommended hours, or to cover lessons for an absent teacher, they may be less likely to question this if they already have a relationship with the school and a sense of responsibility towards it. Many schools offering School Direct choose a different model of teaching practice placements compared with the traditional university model involving two long placements. For School Direct, many students instead spend most of the year at their 'home' school and a period of only around six weeks in another school for a contrasting placement. This kind of arrangement, it seems, may be more likely to lead to the production of student teachers who are familiar with a particular school and who, if employed in the same school at the end of their training year, may be more able to adjust smoothly to that school environment. But will they be able to teach in another school successfully if, in a few years' time, they decide to do

so? Will they be able to reflect in a critical and informed way on the policies and procedures of their 'home' school, helping to improve and develop them? While some may be able to do so, it seems likely that others may learn to comply rather than to critique.

The second variant of School Direct is where teachers are employed and paid by the school and learn 'on the job' (but with dedicated time in a Partner Higher Education Institution, but much less than a traditional PGCE). This variant is essentially an adaptation of the earlier GTP scheme. As Brown et al (2016) observe, "Teaching is conceived in craft-based, technicist terms strengthened by increasing prescription and performativity measures, which require teachers to present and shape knowledge in particular ways. Within this context, conceptions of the relationship between theory and practice have been progressively replaced by conceptions of practice that integrate situated conceptions of theory responsive to the needs of practice" (p.7).

There is also an important question about moral and ethical purpose. It is generally accepted that most teachers are driven by an awareness of the impact which education can have on a young person's life, and feel a sense of responsibility for shaping young people's future life experiences. As Hargreaves et al point out, "Very few teachers enter their profession for its status or image: most become teachers to work with children, to give children a good start in life, and/or to give something back to society" (2007: 22). This commitment to trying to make things better for young people and society in general is something which has always underpinned the teaching profession. Part 2 of the current English Teachers Standards codifies this by setting out in a series of bullet points the expectations for the kinds of 'behaviours and attitudes' which teachers are expected to demonstrate in their 'personal and professional conduct' throughout their careers. This part of the Teachers Standards also, however, politicises the profession by the inclusion of the requirement for teachers to support 'British values' (DfE 2015). While it is beyond the scope of this chapter to explore this issue in any detail, we argue that the university offers the ideal 'space' for student teachers to reflect on the ethical dimensions of the teaching role in all its complexity.

The emergence of formal partnerships between universities and schools since the 1990s had a positive effect of breaking down the artificial division of theory and practice in teacher preparation. Universities had to be explicit about the roles and responsibilities of both parties and schools took on an obligation to provide some 'training' of student teachers, and the

monitoring and overseeing of this enhanced role helped the process of integrating theory with practice.

In recent years, the system within which teachers are educated has undergone radical change which has left many working within it destabilized and demoralized. Within this context, those working as teacher educators, and particularly those working within universities, must find a way to operate on a daily basis which makes some kind of sense for them and for the student teachers with whom they are working. At the same time, policy changes in line with the current government's stated desire to bring about a move towards a 'school-led' system mean that teacher educators increasingly feel the need not only to explain their ways of working but, in some cases, to defend and justify their existence. Shifts in the ways in which schools work with universities, driven partly by changes to the allocations and funding system, have resulted in wide-ranging changes to the location, structure and content of teacher education programmes, with schools increasingly taking on a commissioning role which involves them negotiating with universities about the services they wish to purchase, rather than simply receiving what they are given. Brown et al. (2016) observe the significant change in power in the relationship between school and university and the consequent prioritizing of practical components of learning of how to teach at the expense of theory and reflection.

Changes to teacher education systems have been taking place in many other places around the world. It is outside the scope of this chapter to explore in any detail the kind of developments that have happened in other jurisdictions; suffice to say that it is not the same everywhere. In some places, we also find teacher education being adversely affected by the increasing marketization and fragmentation of the system. In others, the professional status and role of teachers has increased. This seems to go hand in hand with an increase in the status of professional qualifications and therefore in the role and importance of initial teacher education.

<h1>Principles of a successful Initial Teacher Education Programme

If teaching were merely a craft, then an apprentice model of teacher *training* would be appropriate in the preparation of teachers. But we have argued in this chapter that teaching is

a complex activity that has elements of craft, science and art. This being the case, we argue that we require a programme of teacher *education*, for student teachers to understand their classrooms in all their complexity and to understand pupils' learning so that they can plan and if needed modify their teaching strategy accordingly. For most prospective teachers, we see the PGCE as the preferred route into teaching and such courses should offer conceptual understanding of teaching and learning in addition on drawing on research evidence and the practical application of learning theory. For some prospective teachers, an apprentice model may be appropriate. The problem with the English system as it stands is its complexity and uneven funding and as a result it may lead prospective teachers down an inappropriate route. We now offer six principles that we argue underlie any successful teacher education programme and which must be supported by universities, partner schools and policymakers.

First, *coherence*. The differences between the various existing routes into teaching must be clear and easy to understand. At present there is a great deal of room for confusion, for example between the School Direct Salaried and Unsalared routes. Furthermore, the differential charging of fees and the availability of burseries (or not) leads to inequity, further confusion and frustration. A lack of understanding of the requirements, fees and burseries of each route leads to difficulties for student teachers and schools and contributes to problems with recruitment.

Secondly, *stability*. For any system to succeed, there needs to be the appropriate balance of stability and change, innovation and conservation. The teacher education system in England has undergone such a sustained period of rapid change that this balance has been lost. This is important for those working both in schools and in universities, who should be encouraged to invest in high quality provision and staff development rather than trying to keep up with the latest significant policy change.

Thirdly, *responsiveness*. The teacher education system must respond to the needs of key stakeholders within the system, including the changing needs of young people, their parents and future employers. It is essential that we do not have a system within which universities are perceived as existing in an 'ivory tower' divorced from what is happening in the real world, but one in which we understand and acknowledge the pressures and demands of the 'real world' outside the university walls.

Comment [A3]: AQ: Please check if the word 'bursaries' in the two instances starting from "Furthermore, the differential" should read 'bursaries'.

Fourthly, *critical engagement*. It is essential that teachers do not simply accept the system in which they are working but are able to interrogate and challenge the status quo on the basis of their knowledge of theory and practice. We argue that this is one of the key reasons that universities must continue to have a key role in teacher education, in partnership with schools.

Fifthly, *developmental*. We need to consider the development of teachers throughout their careers, rather than focusing solely on the initial training year or the NQT⁷ year in isolation. Teacher education, teacher professional development, teacher learning: these should be things which happen throughout a teacher's career, rather than just at one particular time. We argue that new entrants into the teaching profession should be qualified at Master's level and existing teachers should be incentivized to complete a Master's level qualification as part of their ongoing professional development.

Comment [A4]: AQ: In the sentence "We argue that ...", please clarify whether the word 'incentived' should read 'incentivized' or left as is.

Finally, *research-informed*. A key question for teacher educators working within universities is how to improve the link between research and practice. Teacher educators have always used research to inform their practice, and most teacher education programmes include at least some element of research training for student teachers. As well as using research to support the ongoing development of teacher education programmes, however, there is now an urgent need for teacher educators to utilize research as a way of providing 'credible evidence' of the effectiveness of their practice (Grossman 2008). Grossman argues that there are three kinds of research which need to happen in order for this to succeed: (1) Well-designed and well-executed studies examining the outcomes of different teacher education programmes, using clear, credible procedures for data collection and analysis. (2) Comparative studies teasing out the effects of different programmes, based on characteristics of entrants or the specific effects of particular pedagogical approaches. (3) More 'programmatic research', focusing on a critical set of questions that build on their own findings and provide better, clearer answers.

Maguire (2014) argues that this kind of research is important because of its potential role in combating what she refers to as the 'technology of erasure' (Maguire 2014) by recording and potentially celebrating the work of 'progressive and reforming teacher educationalists'. Ellis and McNichol (2015), meanwhile, argue that we must rebuild the research programme in

teaching and teacher education around theory building, cross-setting intervention research (147).

Comment [A5]: AQ: Please clarify this.

Conclusions

Teaching at its best is a highly skilled, dynamic and creative process that involves the utilization of a range of different types of knowledge and acquired professional expertise; so becoming a ‘good’ teacher is not an easy undertaking. In addition to technical expertise that can be learned ‘on the job’, we argue that teachers need to be able to understand how to apply their subject knowledge in a way that makes sense to their pupils; to understand what empirical research can offer them (and what it can’t); understand how they can research their own classrooms to improve their own teaching and to have a sound conceptual framework for understanding educational issues.

At a time of increasing fragmentation and marketization, teacher education operates within a contested field which makes the role of teacher educators more complex and difficult to navigate. To succeed and survive in this context, teacher educators working in universities must:

- Continue to engage with schools and teachers, contributing to the development of a research-informed and research active profession, and developing even stronger, more constructive relationships with schools.
- Design, undertake and disseminate research which provides credible evidence of the effectiveness of their approaches to teacher education.
- Continue to challenge the ‘erasure’ of contributions made by progressive and reforming teacher educators; continue to emphasize the extent to which teacher education has always been rooted in schools.

¹ The Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills (Ofsted) is a non-ministerial department of the UK government responsible for regulating and inspecting education, care and skills services.

² The Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) is the most common route into teaching in England; normally taught at Master’s level (since 2007), it is a year-long programme for graduates.

³ Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) is the basic requirement for qualification as a teacher in England. Until 2012 it was a requirement for all teachers in state-maintained schools; since that time academies have been exempt from this requirement.

⁴ Circulars are official government documents that communicate new requirements. 9/92 signifies the issue date: September 1992.

⁵ 'New Labour' refers to the government elected in 1997 under Prime Minister Tony Blair, during which the party was presented as a reformed entity which had rejected some of the left-wing principles which had previously characterized the party and which had endorsed market economics.

⁶ The Graduate Teacher Programme allowed graduates to work as unqualified teachers and train on the job to gain QTS.

⁷ Newly qualified teachers undergo a year's probation before their QTS is ratified.